UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,683	12/05/2003	Michael J. Gauer	200901536-1	9079

22879 7590 10/07/2009

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER	
THOMAS, ASHISH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/07/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/728,683	GAUER, MICHAEL J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ASHISH K. THOMAS	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-13,15-20,22-28 and 31-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-13, 15-20, 22-28, and 31-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/17/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In page 11, lines 25-28 of the remarks, the Applicant argues that "determining whether user-selected margins exceeds a boundary that defines a printable area of a printer, as taught by Phang, is not the same as 'checking whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer margins,' as recited in claim 7." The Applicant goes on to state that "what Phang does is to check whether the entire work area as defined by user-selected margins are within printer boundaries, which is fundamentally different form the subject matter of claim 7." (page 12, lines 1-4 of the remarks). Applicant asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been prompted to combine these reference teachings.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Note that the Phang reference was incorporated in the rejection to simply teach the ability to determine if the data is within a set boundary as the Applicant correctly points out in page 11, lines 23-25 of the remarks submitted on 6/17/2009. After looking at Phang, one of ordinary skill in the art can make some obvious changes. One such obvious change could reasonable be the ability to alter the boundaries or the ability to define the data within the boundaries. This actually falls under one of the rationales cited in KSR v. Teleflex-applying a known technology to a known device(method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results. So it follow that, incorporating Brewster

and Johnson with Phang would obviously teach checking whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and the printer margins, as recited in claim 7 and other independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7-13, 15-17, 20, 24, 25-28 31, 32, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster(U.S. 6,809,841) in view of Johnson(U.S. 5,930,350) and further in view of Phang(U.S. 6,437,876).

Regarding claims 7, Brewster teaches a computer-implemented method for printing a document the method comprising: receiving document data from an application, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document; (**Figure 1, step 106 teaches sending a print job, and figure 1, step 108 teaches the reception of the print job at the printer.**) and formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and sender information, and the sender information is located outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins. (**Figure 1, step 104 teaches an identification mark associated with the user's identification. This identification mark is an example of sender information. Figure 1, step 108 teaches that the**

identification mark is printed on each page of the print job. Column 3, lines 25-33 teaches that the mark associated with the user can be printed in a selected corner of the document. The selected corner can be categorized as an area that is outside the document data area yet within the allowable print boundaries.)

Brewster merely teaches an identification mark that is selected by the user. Brewster does not teach actually accessing information associated with a sender of the document data.

Johnson, on the other hand, teaches accessing information associated with a sender of the document data. **(The abstract teaches receiving print jobs, identifying the sender of the print jobs, and retrieving information about the sender from a database.**)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster with Johnson to realize a method that receives document data for a print job, accesses information associated with the sender of the print job, and then prints the received document data and accessed sender information.

The motivation here is to access sender data that might not be readily available with the print job. Also, not including a great deal of sender data in the print job can make the transmission of the print job easier because of the lower memory usage.

The combination of Brewster and Johnson is silent on checking if certain data fits within document margins.

Phang, on the other hand, teaches checking if data falls within the printable document margins(**column 1, lines 55-65**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster and Johnson with Phang to put forth the subject matter claimed in claim 7.

The motivation is to ensure that a document is successfully printed. The checking process achieves the successful output of data by making sure that all data are printed within the allowable print margins.

Regarding claim 20, Brewster teaches a system comprising an apparatus comprising: a memory, wherein the memory is operable to store document data from an application, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document; (**Figure 1, step 106 teaches sending a print job, and figure 1, step 108 teaches the reception of the print job at the printer. This, in turn, inherently teaches the apparatus as well as the memory stated in the claim language.**) and a processor coupled to the memory, the processor operable to format a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and sender information, and the sender information is located outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins. (**Figure 1, step 104 teaches an identification mark associated with the user's identification. This identification mark is an example of sender information. Figure 1, step 108 teaches that the identification mark is printed on each page of the print job. Column 3, lines 25-33 teaches that the mark associated with the user can be printed in a selected corner**

of the document. The selected corner can be categorized as an area that is outside the document data area yet within the allowable print boundaries. The processor is inherently taught in the reference.)

Brewster merely teaches an identification mark that is selected by the user. Brewster does not teach actually accessing information associated with a sender of the document data.

Johnson, on the other hand, teaches accessing information associated with a sender of the document data. **(The abstract teaches receiving print jobs, identifying the sender of the print jobs, and retrieving information about the sender from a database.)**

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster with Johnson to realize a system that receives document data for a print job, accesses information associated with the sender of the print job, and then prints the received document data and accessed sender information.

The motivation here is to access sender data that might not be readily available with the print job. Also, not including a great deal of sender data in the print job can make the transmission of the print job easier because of the lower memory usage.

The combination of Brewster and Johnson is silent on checking if certain data fits within document margins.

Phang, on the other hand, teaches checking if data falls within the printable document margins(**column 1, lines 55-65**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster and Johnson with Phang to put forth the subject matter claimed in claim 20.

The motivation is to ensure that a document is successfully printed. The checking process achieves the successful output of data by making sure that all data are printed within the allowable print margins.

Regarding claim 24, Brewster teaches an article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable medium that stores instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations(**Column 3, lines 10-12**) comprising: determining whether document data from an application has been received, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document; (**Figure 1, step 106 teaches sending a print job, and figure 1, step 108 teaches the reception of the print job at the printer. This, in turn, inherently teaches the determining operation.**) and formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and sender information, and the sender information is located outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins. (**Figure 1, step 104 teaches an identification mark associated with the user's identification. This identification mark is an example of sender information. Figure 1, step 108 teaches that the identification mark is printed on each page of the print job. Column 3, lines 25-33 teaches that the mark associated with the user can be printed in a selected corner of the document.**

The selected corner can be categorized as an area that is outside the document data area yet within the allowable print boundaries.)

Brewster merely teaches an identification mark that is selected by the user. Brewster does not teach actually accessing information associated with a sender of the document data.

Johnson, on the other hand, teaches accessing information associated with a sender of the document data. **(The abstract teaches receiving print jobs, identifying the sender of the print jobs, and retrieving information about the sender from a database.)**

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster with Johnson to realize an article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable medium that stores instructions operable to receive document data for a print job, access information associated with the sender of the print job, and then print the received document data and accessed sender information.

The motivation here is to access sender data that might not be readily available with the print job. Also, not including a great deal of sender data in the print job can make the transmission of the print job easier because of the lower memory usage.

The combination of Brewster and Johnson is silent on checking if certain data fits within document margins.

Phang, on the other hand, teaches checking if data falls within the printable document margins**(column 1, lines 55-65)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster and Johnson with Phang to put forth the subject matter claimed in claim 24.

The motivation is to ensure that a document is successfully printed. The checking process achieves the successful output of data by making sure that all data are printed within the allowable print margins.

Regarding claim 31, Brewster teaches a system comprising memory for storing document data received from an application, the document data comprising data for printing at least a portion of the document; **(Figure 1, step 106 teaches sending a print job, and figure 1, step 108 teaches the reception of the print job at the printer. This, in turn, inherently teaches the apparatus as well as the memory stated in the claim language.)** and a means for formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and sender information, and the sender information is located outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins. **(Figure 1, step 104 teaches an identification mark associated with the user's identification. This identification mark is an example of sender information. Figure 1, step 108 teaches that the identification mark is printed on each page of the print job. Column 3, lines 25-33 teaches that the mark associated with the user can be printed in a selected corner of the document. The selected corner can be categorized as an area that is outside the document data area yet within the allowable print boundaries. The processor is inherently taught in the reference.)**

Brewster merely teaches an identification mark that is selected by the user. Brewster does not teach a means for actually accessing information associated with a sender of the document data.

Johnson, on the other hand, teaches accessing information associated with a sender of the document data. **(The abstract teaches receiving print jobs, identifying the sender of the print jobs, and retrieving information about the sender from a database.)**

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster with Johnson to realize a system that receives document data for a print job, accesses information associated with the sender of the print job, and then prints the received document data and accessed sender information.

The motivation here is to access sender data that might not be readily available with the print job. Also, not including a great deal of sender data in the print job can make the transmission of the print job easier because of the lower memory usage.

The combination of Brewster and Johnson is silent on checking if certain data fits within document margins.

Phang, on the other hand, teaches checking if data falls within the printable document margins(**column 1, lines 55-65**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster and Johnson with Phang to put forth the subject matter claimed in claim 31.

The motivation is to ensure that a document is successfully printed. The checking process achieves the successful output of data by making sure that all data are printed within the allowable print margins.

Regarding claims 8, 25, and 32, Phang further teaches initiating an alert if the data cannot fit within the printable margins**(column 1, lines 64-67)**. Therefore, it would be obvious to alert the user if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between the document margin data areas and printer allowable margins.

Regarding claims 9 and 26, Phang teaches allowing format of information to be changed if an alert is initiated**(Column 2, lines 25-35)**. Therefore, it would be obvious to allow the format of the accessed information to be changed if an alert is initiated.

Regarding claims 10 and 27, Johnson teaches associating the received document data with the sender of the document data**(Abstract teaches this. Furthermore, figure 2a illustrates a correlator 118 that allows a print manager to correlate data with users.)**.

Regarding claim 11, Johnson teaches that associating the received document data with a sender of the document data comprises determining a sender identifier accompanying the document data. **(Abstract and Figure 2)**

Regarding claim 12, Johnson teaches that accessing information associated with a sender of the document data comprises querying a database comprising sender associated information. **(Abstract teaches a database. And data is retrieved from the database. This reads on the querying process.)**

Regarding claims 13, Brewster further teaches generating a printer message comprising the formatted page. (**Figure 1, step 108 teaches that a page is printed. Note that the Examiner is interpreting the generation of a printer message simply as a printout step.**)

Regarding claim 15, Brewster teaches that document data includes data relating to appearance and content of a document. (**Column 2, lines 62-67**)

Regarding claim 16, Brewster further teaches that the processor is operable to format the document data in relation with formatting requirements associated with a printer. (**Column 2, lines 43-47**)

Regarding claim 17, Brewster further teaches that the apparatus comprises a printer driver. (**Column 2, lines 50-52**)

Regarding claims 28 and 38, Johnson further teaches that accessing information associated with the sender of document data comprises accessing information identifying the sender. (**Abstract and figure 2**)

3. Claims 2-6, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster(U.S. 6,809,841) in view of Johnson(U.S. 5,930,350), Phang(U.S. 6,437,876), and Masaki(U.S. 2002/0051206).

Regarding claims 2, 18, and 22, the combination of Brewster, Johnson, and Phang teaches the subject matter claimed in the respective base claims. Note that this combination also teaches initiating an alert if accessed information does not fit between the document data and the printer allowable margins.

But this combination does not teach receiving a request to format information associated with a sender of document data, and generating a user interface that allows formatting of information associated with a sender of document data.

Masaki, on the other hand, teaches receiving a request to format information associated with a sender of document data(**Paragraph 45 teaches adjusting print position of header and footer. As illustrated in paragraph 47 and figure 5, to adjust the print positions, a user interface is used. Note that adjusting the print position of header information is an example of formatting sender info since the header information contains the name of the sender.**), and generating a user interface that allows formatting of information associated with a sender of document data(**Figure 5 and paragraph 47 teach a user interface displayed on the CRT 10.**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster, Johnson, and Phang with Masaki to put forth the subject matter claimed in claims 2, 18, and 22.

The motivation here is to provide the user with the opportunity to designate the layout settings in a manner he/she desires.

Regarding claim 3, Masaki further teaches that the user interface allows specification of the orientation in which information associated with a sender of document is placed on the page, wherein the orientation is selectable from one of plural possible orientations. (**Paragraph 47 discusses print positions such as right side setting, centering, and so on. This is an example of orientation. Furthermore, the concept of plurality of orientations is inherently taught in the reference.**)

Regarding claim 4, Masaki further teaches that the user interface allows specification of information associated with a sender of document data. (**Paragraph 47 teaches "specification of...kind of information to be printed as header/footer information."**)

Regarding claim 5, Masaki further teaches that the user interface allows specification of the presentation style of information associated with a sender of document data. (**The position of sender information in a page can be one aspect of the presentation style. Note that paragraph 47 teaches print positions of the sender information.**)

Regarding claim 6, Masaki teaches that the user interface allows specification of the location of the information associated with a sender of document data. (**Print positions of sender data, detailed in paragraph 47, read on the location of sender data.**)

Regarding claims 19 and 23, Masaki further teaches that the user interface allows specification of the content and appearance of information associated with a sender of document data. (**Paragraph 47**)

Regarding claims 34-37, the combination of Brewster, Johnson, and Phang teaches the subject matter claimed in the respective base claims.

But this combination is silent on an application that facilitates displaying and editing the document.

Masaki further teaches an application that facilitates displaying and editing the document. (**Figure 5 illustrates that a document is displayed while the user**

specifies certain settings. The change made to certain print settings is an example of an editing process.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster, Johnson, and Phang with Masaki to fully put forth the subject matter claimed in claims 34-37.

The motivation here is to provide the user with the opportunity to designate the layout settings in a manner he/she desires.

4. Claims 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster(U.S. 6,809,841) in view of Johnson(U.S. 5,930,350), Masaki(U.S. 2002/0051206), and Phang(U.S. 6,437,876).

Regarding claim 33, Brewster teaches a computer-implemented method for printing a document, the method comprising: receiving document data from an application, the document data comprises data for printing at least a portion of the document(**Figure 1, step 106 teaches sending a print job, and figure 1, step 108 teaches the reception of the print job at the printer. Furthermore**); and formatting a page to be printed such that the page comprises at least a portion of the received document data and sender information, and the sender information is located outside document data area and inside printer allowable margins. (**Figure 1, step 104 teaches an identification mark associated with the user's identification. This identification mark is an example of sender information. Figure 1, step 108 teaches that the identification mark is printed on each page of the print job. Column 3, lines 25-33 teaches that the mark associated with the user can be printed in a selected corner**

of the document. The selected corner can be categorized as an area that is outside the document data area yet within the allowable print boundaries.)

But Brewster is silent on determining an identifier associated with a sender of document data; and accessing information associated with the sender identifier, including querying a database comprising sender associated information.

Johnson teaches determining an identifier associated with a sender of document data; and accessing information associated with the sender identifier, including querying a database comprising sender associated information. (**The abstract teaches receiving print jobs, identifying the sender of the print jobs, and retrieving information about the sender from a database.**)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster with Johnson to realize a method that receives document data for a print job, accesses information associated with the sender of the print job, and then prints the received document data and accessed sender information in such a way that the accessed sender information is located outside document data areas and inside printer allowable margins.

The motivation here is to access sender data that might not be part of the print job. Also, not including a great deal of sender data in the print job can make the transmission of the print job easier because of the lowered memory usage.

The combination of Brewster and Johnson does not teach an application that facilitates displaying and editing the document; generating a user interface that allows

formatting of content, location, orientation, and appearance of information; and generating a printer message comprising the formatted page.

Masaki, on the other hand, teaches an application that facilitates displaying and editing the document(**Figure 5 illustrates that a document is displayed while the user specifies certain settings. The change made to certain print settings is an example of an editing process**); generating a user interface that allows formatting of content, location, orientation, and appearance of information associated with a sender(**Paragraph 45 teaches inputting sender information at an user interface; this is an example of formatting the content. Paragraph 45 also teaches setting the position of the sender info; this, in turn, has some type of effect on the location, orientation, and appearance of the sender information.**); and generating a printer message comprising the formatted page. (**Printer 1500 in figure 2 prints the data. Note that the generation of a printer message, as stated in the claim language, is equated to the act of printing.**)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster and Johnson with Masaki to put forth a print method that allows a user to edit a document in such a way that the user can specify the position of sender information.

The motivation here is to provide the user with the opportunity to designate the layout settings in a manner he/she desires.

The combination of Brewster, Johnson, and Masaki fails to teach checking whether the formatted page fits between the document data areas and printer allowable

margins, and initiating an alert if the page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins.

Phang teaches checking whether the formatted page fits between the document data areas and printer allowable margins**(column 1, lines 55-65)**, and initiating an alert if the page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins**(column 1, lines 64-67)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Brewster, Johnson, and Masaki with Phang to put forth print method that checks whether the accessed information for the formatted page fits between the document data areas and printer allowable margins, and initiates an alert if the accessed information for the formatted page does not fit between the document data areas and the printer allowable margins.

The motivation is to ensure that a document is successfully printed. The checking process achieves the successful output of data by making sure that all data are printed within the allowable print margin.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHISH K. THOMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 0700-1530 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ashish K Thomas/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625